



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/609,238	06/27/2003	Jean D. Paoli	301662.01	7738
22971	7590	07/23/2009		
MICROSOFT CORPORATION			EXAMINER	
ONE MICROSOFT WAY			NGUYEN, LE V	
REDMOND, WA 98052-6399			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2174	
NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
07/23/2009	ELECTRONIC			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

roks@microsoft.com
ntovar@microsoft.com

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/609,238	Applicant(s) PAOLI ET AL.
	Examiner LE NGUYEN	Art Unit 2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If no period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED. (35 U.S.C. § 133).

Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 March 2009.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-6,8-14 and 63-65 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-6,8-14 and 63-65 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/901b)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____

5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to an amendment filed 3/16/09.
2. Claims 1-6, 8-14 and 63-65 are pending in this application; and, claims 1, 14 and 63 are independent claims. Claims 7, 15-62 and 66-83 have been cancelled; and, claims 1, 14 and 63 have been amended. This action is made Final.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 1-6, 8-14, 63 and 64 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaker et al. ("Kaker", US 2001/0037218 A1) in view of Capps (US 5,666,502), and further in view of Venkatesh et al. ("Venkatesh", US 2003/0201320 A1).

As per claims 1 and 14, Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising: receiving input to open a data file having a solution (par. [0125]; PDF file opens in response to user input); discovering/deploying, without user interaction, the solution, i.e. discovering/deploying a solution (par. [0125]; Prescription Form/solution provides data for automatic form filling); displaying, by opening the data file with the solution, an electronic form having operable fields (par. [0125]; users can complete the

form); and enabling a user to enter data into the operable fields of the electronic form (par. [0125]; space in an on-screen form are provided in order for users to enter, for example, a signature to complete the form). Kaker does not explicitly disclose defining the availability of one or more actions to the user when entering the data into each operable field of the electronic form. However, defining the availability of one or more actions to the user when entering the data into each operable field of the electronic form is well known as taught by Capps (figs. 5B and 13A-14C; col. 10, line 45 through col. 11, line 14; col. 12, lines 51-53; col. 16, line 23 through col. 17, line 7). In view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPG2d at 1397 (2007), it would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Capps with the method of Kaker to alleviate the user from having to type in or otherwise enter the data and, therefore, enter data with greater ease. Kaker and Capps does not explicitly disclose formatting data of one or more operable fields. Venkatesh teaches formatting data of one or more operable fields (par [0025]). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Venkatesh with the method of Kaker and Capps in order to save time, especially in view of KSR, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPG2d at 1397 (2007).

As per claim 2, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising receiving data entered into the selected operable field of the electronic form and altering the data in the data file so as to correspondingly reflect the data received (figs. 5B and 13A-14C; blank field to fields with data).

As per claim 3, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the availability of one or more actions to the user concurs with an event elected from the group consisting of: an association of an input device being used by the user with one said operable field; a pen/stylus/cursor position corresponding to an input device being used by the user is proximal to one said operable field; one said operable field is selected by the user by use of an input device; one said operable field on the electronic form is made to be an active field by operation of an input device being used by the user; specific conditions are met wherein specific conditions are met with respect to the data in the one said operable field; when the user's mouse pointer for an input device rests over, within, or proximal to an editable region of one said operable field; when the user's mouse pointer for an input device rests over, within, or proximal to an editable region of one said operable field and the mouse is clicked one or more times (Capps: fig. 2 and col. 7, lines 51-59).

As per claim 4, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein each said action is selected from the group consisting of: a request for *one or more of a* display of a menu and an activation of a menu item of a menu (par. [0092] and [0202]); an editing operation with respect to data in *at least one* said operable field that is one or more of an undo function, a redo function, a copy function, a cut function, a paste function, an insertion of a hyperlink, and a carriage return or line feed function; performing a character formatting operation with respect to data in at least one said

operable field that is one or more of a boldface, an italics, an underlining, a change of font size or font color, character spacing, and text effects (par. [0052]); and adding, entering, updating or deleting, with respect to at least one said operable field, one or more of a repeating operable field, an optional operable field, a spreadsheet, a table, a row or a column in a table, a text box, multiple spaces, a header, a footer, an image, a graphic, a picture, a link to an image, a link to a graphic, a link to a picture, single line plain text, multi-line plain text, single line formatted text, multi-line formatted text, rich text, a whole number, a decimal, a true/false distinction, a date, and a time (par. [0052]). Kaker does not explicitly disclose the menu being a tool bar wherein users can activate a command tool. Official Notice is taken that menus in a tool bar format wherein users can activate a command tool are well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate a tool bar format wherein users can activate a command tool to the method of Kaker in order to provide users with an implementation preference.

As per claim 5, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the availability of each said action is determined on the basis of the context of each said operable field of the electronic form with respect to at least one other said operable field of the electronic form (Capps: figs. 5B and 13A-14C; col. 10, line 45 through col. 11, line 14; col. 16, line 23 through col. 17, line 7).

As per claim 6, although Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method and

computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising discovering the solution (par. [0092]), Kaker does not explicitly disclose discovering a solution identifier in the data file, computing a special name from the solution identifier, and discovering the solution using the special name. Official Notice is taken that having an identifier and looking up the name from a look up table such as in the case wherein a hash map computes a name from the identifier is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate a data file containing an identifier wherein from the identifier, a name of a solution is computed to the method of Kaker given that saving as an identifier or hash rather than the actual name is more compact and, therefore, saves space.

As per claim 8, although the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising a data file (Kaker: par. [0125]), the modified Kaker does not explicitly disclose the file being written in XML. However, files written in XML are well known in the art (see col. 2, lines 32-40 of Hitchcock et al., US 6,345,278 B1). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate such an implementation with the method of the modified Kaker given that it is easily interpretable both by people and machine and given that it saves time when used in conjunction with an existing parser rather than having to build one from scratch. *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1739-41, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395, 1396 (2007) quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336-37 (Fed. Cir. 2006); Also, as clarified in *KSR*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

As per claim 9, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein: the solution includes a presentation application that includes the electronic form and the presentation file contains logic to give the display of the electronic form a graphical, visual representation of the operable fields (figs. 2, 4-8, 17-25).

As per claim 10, although the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising a presentation application (Kaker: par. [0125]; Capps: figs. 5B and 13A-14C), the modified Kaker does not explicitly disclose the presentation application being written in XSLT. Official Notice is taken that presentation applications being written in XSLT is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate the method of having presentation applications written in XSLT with the method of the modified Kaker given in order to provide a nice format and transform, for example, XML to other formats given that some devices support only certain formats.

As per claim 11, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein the solution includes a logic application for ensuring the validity of the received data that is entered into the operable fields of the electronic form (Kaker: par. [0058], [0073] and [0121]).

As per claim 12, although the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method

comprising a logic application (Capps: figs. 6(A-B); col. 8, lines 48-60), the modified Kaker does not explicitly include an XML schema. However, the implementation of XML and generating an XML schema is well known in the art for many years. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate such well known implementations with the method of the modified Kaker in order to put constraints on how data is represented to make it easier for different programs to deal with the same data. See *KSR Int'l Co. v. Teleflex, Inc.*, 127 S. Ct. 1727, 1739-41, 82 USPQ2d 1385, 1395, 1396 (2007) quoting *In re Kahn*, 441 F.3d 977, 988, 78 USPQ2d 1329, 1336-37 (Fed. Cir. 2006); Also, as clarified in *KSR*, 127 S. Ct. 1727 at 1742, 82 USPQ2d at 1397 (2007).

As per claim 13, although the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method comprising an electronic form (Kaker: par. [0125]; Capps: figs. 5B and 13A-14C)), the modified Kaker does not explicitly disclose it being written in XHTML. Official Notice is taken that using XHTML is well known in the art. It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to incorporate XHTML to the method of the modified Kaker in order to display such things as forms in browsers wherein displaying in browsers are additionally beneficial in that it does not require additional installation of software on desktops which would require additional support costs and that it is flexible, allowing users to access such things as forms from anywhere.

Claim 63 is similar in scope to claim 2 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 64 is similar in scope to claim 3 and is therefore rejected under similar rationale.

5. Claim 65 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kaker et al. ("Kaker", US 2001/0037218 A1) in view of Capps (US 5,666,502) and Venkatesh et al. ("Venkatesh", US 2003/0201320 A1) as applied to claim 63, and further in view of Turpin (US 5,640,501).

As per claim 65, the modified Kaker teaches a method and computer-readable medium comprising computer-executable instructions that perform the method wherein each said action is selected from the group consisting of: displaying a menu containing one or more menu items with the electronic form (Capps: fig. 5B, menu); displaying a toolbar containing one or more command tools with the electronic form (fig. 3; col. 7, lines 7-15; printed strip of material 128 include a number of indicia 130 so that when a stylus is engaged over one of the indicia 130, the computer responds to the contact as if the indicia were a "button" wherein a "button" can be an image or an electro-mechanical button); selecting a menu item from a menu that is displayed with the electronic form (Capps: fig. 5B; col. 10, line 45 through col. 11, line 14); selecting a command button/tool from a tool bar that is displayed with the electronic form (Capps: fig. 5B, element 130); and adding, entering, updating or deleting, with respect to a data-entry field in the electronic form, one or more of a repeating data-entry field, an optional data-entry field, a spreadsheet, a table, a row or a column in a table, a text box, multiple spaces, a header, a footer, an image, a graphic, a picture, a link to an image, a link to a graphic, a link to a picture, single line plain text, multi-line plain text, single line

formatted text, multi-line formatted text, rich text, a whole number, a decimal, a true/false distinction, a date, and a time (Capps: fig. 5B; entering either one of a single line plain text or single line formatted text).

Although the modified Kaker teaches an editing operation with respect to data in a data-entry field in the electronic form (Kaker: par. [0125]), the modified Kaker does not explicitly disclose either an editing operation that is one or more of an undo function, a redo function, a copy function, a cut function, a paste function, an insertion of a hyperlink, and a carriage return or line feed function nor a character formatting operation with respect to data in a data- entry field in the electronic form that is one or more of a boldface, an italics, an underlining, a change of font size or font color, character spacing, and text effects. However, such editing and formatting operations are well known in the art as taught by Turpin (fig. 6; col. 16, line 46 through col. 17, line 46; functions include, for example, undo and formatting includes, for example, font size; see also Nishiyam (col. 6, lines 36-50). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to include the method of Turpin with the method of the modified Kaker so that forms may be customized and modified to suit the needs of the user such as by displaying an entry item in a conspicuous manner.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-6, 8-14 and 63-65 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Inquires

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner Lê Nguyen whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4068**. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday from 7:00 am to 3:30 pm (EST).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Dennis Chow, can be reached at **(571) 272-7767**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Ivn
Patent Examiner
July 11, 2009

/DENNIS-DOON CHOW/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2174